

A0706018

Exhibit B

NEUSTAR

November 1, 2006

To: All 760 NPA Code Holders and Interested Industry Members (California)

Subject: Final Minutes of Updated Relief Planning Meeting for 760 NPA

Attached are the final minutes to the Updated Relief Planning meeting for the California 760 NPA conducted on October 10, 2006. Also included are a complete set of maps of the alternatives reviewed by the industry.

If you have any questions, please give me a call at (805) 520-1945 or via email at joe.cocke@neustar.biz.

Sincerely,

Joseph R. Cocke Sr. NPA Relief Planner NANPA

C: Cherrie Conner – CPUC – Telecom Division

Enclosures



CALIFORNIA 760 NPA UPDATED RELIEF PLANNING MEETING FINAL MINUTES

October 10, 2006, 9:30 AM (PT) VIA CONFERENCE CALL

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS & AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Joe Cocke, NeuStar NANPA Senior NPA Relief Planner opened the meeting with introductions, a review of the agenda, the objectives of the meeting and NANPA's roles and responsibilities. A list of the attendees can be found in Attachment # 1.

CONSENSUS PROCESS AND NPA RELIEF PLANNING GUIDELINES

Joe stated the ATIS (Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions) approved industry consensus process would be followed. He read highlights of the consensus process and explained how consensus is determined. In addition Joe stated that issues or positions could be expressed in the form of a Statement for the Record (in writing) and they could be conveyed at any point during the meetings. The NPA Code Relief and Planning and Notification Guidelines were referenced and are available for review. This document, as well as other relevant NPA assignment and relief guidelines, may be downloaded from the ATIS web site at (http://www.atis.org/inc/docs.asp). Silence will be considered agreement with a proposal, based on those on the call at the time for which consensus is called.

PURPOSE OF MEETING

Joe gave an overview of the 760 history of relief planning back in 1998 which resulted in the CPUC deciding on a split and then suspended the order due to the extension of the forecasted exhaust. NANPA has assigned the 442 NPA as the new relief NPA. With the forecasted exhaust at 3Q2009, the CPUC- staff has requested NANPA to convene a meeting with the industry to update the recommended relief alternatives. Additionally, the CPUC has determined that because so much time has passed and the requirements in the PU Code, another round of at least one local jurisdiction meeting and at least three public meetings are to be held in the near future. The staff will secure the public meeting locations according to the relief alternatives selected today. After the industry reviews the results of the public meetings the results of this planning process will be filed with the CPUC.

STATUS OF CALIFORNIA 760 NPA

Joe stated that as of October 9, 2006, there are 717 codes assigned, 42 codes available for assignment in the lottery plus 23 codes set aside for the Pooling Administration for a total of 65 codes remaining for assignment in this NPA; and a total of 41 Un-Assignable codes (UAs) including the 23 set aside for the PA and 18 actual UAs. Joe reviewed the eighteen UA codes as follows: N11s, 442, 555, 570, 700, 760, 853, 950, 958, 959 and 976. There are 84 rate areas in the 760 NPA – 59 rate centers are mandatory pooling, 3 rate centers are mandatory pooling with one service provider, 21 rate centers are optional pooling and 1 is excluded. (There is one grandfathered 760 code assigned to the SNDG:SNDG rate area: 612 in the 619 NPA). (It was determined that the grandfathered 719 NXX code had been returned during September). Joe provided the 2006 YTD code assignments as follows: Jan=3, Feb=0, Mar=8, Apr=2, May=1, Jun=0, Jul=1, Aug=4, and Sep=2 for a total of 21 assigned.

Jeopardy was declared in February 1999 and the current rationed rate is 2 codes per month. Joe informed the participants that at the present rationed rate the current April 2006 NRUF forecast projects the 760 to exhaust in 3Q2009 (he mentioned this forecast is not expected to change with the next publication of the October 2006 NRUF forecast. The new NRUF forecasted demand rate is 46 codes per year which equates to 3.8 codes per month and is used in the projected lives of the alternatives. Cecilia Louie, Pooling Implementation Manager, stated there are 1129 blocks available and in the last twelve months there were 468 blocks assigned, that 22 codes (19 for pool replenishment and 3 for LRNs) have been assigned in the last 12 months and their present forecast will require 11 codes in the next twelve months – 11 for pool replenishment. She also mentioned the 760 has been in pooling since August 2002.

REVIEW PLANNING DOCUMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR THE 760 NPA

Joe mentioned the forecasted exhaust is stated in error as 4Q2008 in the updated planning document, it should be 3Q2009. There are two 2-way split alternatives and one all services overlay alternative. Joe stated he will review each one of these alternatives then open it up for discussion of all the alternatives and for any additional suggestions. Then the industry can look for those alternatives to eliminate.

Joe advised the participants that he identified the following additional companies that hold blocks instead of codes: Cbeyond and Telekenex

There were two previously grandfathered CO Codes assigned to one rate area outside of the 760 NPA. For planning purposes these codes were retained in "Area A" of each of the split alternatives:

SNDG:SNDG rate area NXX codes: 719 and 612 – Wireless service provider (it was noted the 719 code was in the process of being returned)
Also, the following special service codes are shown in the LERG at SNDG rate area: SNDG:SNDG rate area NXX codes: 853 – Time Service; 570 - HVCI

Alternative # 1 – NPA Split

The proposed boundary line basically follows the San Diego County line to the Mexican border. There are 14 rate areas west of the split line in Area B and 70 rate areas east and north of the split line in Area A. This alternative keeps the cities and communities, on both sides of the split line, in tact, and does not split any cities. This is the same split previously ordered by the CPUC.

Alternative # 2 – NPA Split

This split is an expansion of Alternative # 1; the split boundary line basically follows the southern borders of the Pinyon and Indio rate centers and then along the eastern borders of the Calipatria, Brawley and Holtville rate centers to the Mexican border. This split retains all the rate centers in LATA 732 and also includes the Salton rate center which is in LATA 973. There are 22 rate areas west of the split line in Area B and 62 rate areas east and north of the split line in Area A. The proposed split keeps the northern San Diego County and Imperial Valley together

in one NPA. This alternative keeps the cities and communities, on both sides of the split line, in tact, and does not split any cities.

Alternative #3 – All Services Overlay

This alternative is an all services distributed overlay. Customers would retain their current telephone numbers; 1 plus ten-digit dialing by all customers between and within area codes in the area covered by the new area code would be required.

Total CO Codes = 716 Rate Centers = 84 Area code life = 17 years

ADDITIONAL RELIEF ALTERNATIVES

There was one additional alternative suggested by the industry for consideration during the meeting. Modify Alternative #2 and move the Salton rate center to Area A. Thus Area B will only be those rate centers is LATA 732. This will be referred to as **Alternative #4**.

Alternative #4 – NPA Split

The split boundary line basically follows the southern border of the Salton rate center and then along the eastern borders of the Calipatria, Brawley and Holtville rate centers to the Mexican border. This split retains those rate centers in LATA 732 in one area code. There are 21 rate areas west of the split line in Area B and 63 rate areas east and north of the split line in Area A. The proposed split keeps the northern San Diego County and Imperial Valley together. This alternative keeps the cities and communities, on both sides of the split line, in tact, and does not split any cities.

It was noted that the customers in Winterhaven rate center (which is in LATA 666) have a community of interest with Yuma, AZ rather than toward El Centro. It was also noted that Palo Verde rate center is in LATA 730, Salton rate center is in LATA 973 with the Palm Springs rate centers and the northern San Diego County is in LATA 732.

DISCUSSION OF RELIEF ALTERNATIVES

Develop Pros & Cons of each alternative & discuss communities of interest? It was noted that of the split alternatives there will be no portions of the cities in 760 NPA split off. Joe mentioned that even if there is general desire by the industry to only recommend an overlay that it would be

desirable for the industry to select potential split alternatives that could be implemented if the CPUC selected a split instead of the overlay.

ALTERNATIVE #1 -2-way Split

PROs:

Keeps the cities on both sides of the split line in tact.

Maintains seven digit dialing on each side of the split

A split is more cost effective for Frontier Telco than an overlay

CONs:

This alternative splits LATA 732

Imbalanced projected lives

Additional complexity due to porting with a split

Negative Customer impacts to change telephone numbers, business cards, letter heads etc.

Requires businesses to re-educate their customers of new numbers

ALTERNATIVE #2 -2-way Split

PROs:

This keeps all the rate centers in LATA 732 together plus the Salton rate center with LATA 732 in one NPA.

Keeps the cities on both sides of the split line in tact.

Lives are closer to being balanced

A split is more cost effective for Frontier Telco than an overlay

CONs:

This splits the Salton rate center from LATA 973.

Additional complexity due to porting with a split

Negative Customer impacts to change telephone numbers, business cards, letter heads etc.

Requires businesses to re-educate their customers of new numbers

ALTERNATIVE #3 – the overlay

PROs:

No customers change their phone number and no cities will be split any further,

Recent experience with 310 overlay resulted in fewer customer complaints than the 909 split

No change in the geographic area of the 760 NPA and it does not shrink.

No one has to change their existing area code.

No consumers on the wrong side of the split, all are treated equally.

Any future area code relief has no impact on customers.

The overlay would be the most beneficial alternative for the customers

CONs:

If only the 7-d number is advertised an overlay requires stationery and advertising changes

Customers will be required to dial 1+10 digit dialing for all calls

An overlay is more expensive for Frontier Telco than a split

ALTERNATIVE #4

This is a modification of the Alternative # 2 that retains all the rate centers in LATA 732 in one NPA.

PROs:

Keeps the cities on both sides of the split line in tact.

Keeps the Salton rate center communities of interest with the Indio area.

Similar to Alt #2 – the projected lives are closer in balance.

Keeps LATAs in tact

A split is more cost effective for Frontier Telco than an overlay

CONs:

Imperial County gets two area codes.

Additional complexity due to porting with a split

Negative Customer impacts to change telephone numbers, business cards, letter heads etc.

Requires businesses to re-educate their customers of new numbers

CONSENSUS ON RELIEF ALTERNATIVES

Joe asked the industry to decide through a process of elimination which alternatives they wished to present at the local jurisdiction and public meetings and their desired alternative to be recommended to the CPUC. A proposal was made and consensus reached to recommend Alternative # 3, the overlay, to the CPUC as the industry's recommended method of area code relief for the 760 NPA. A proposal was made and consensus reached to recommend Alternative # 4 if the CPUC should decide to a order a NPA split as the method of area code relief for the 760 NPA.

A proposal was made and consensus reached to take to the local jurisdiction and public meetings split Alternatives #1 and #4 in addition to the overlay Alternative #3, the industry's recommendation.

CONSENSUS ON RECOMMENDED PUBLIC MEETING LOCATIONS

A recommendation was made, and consensus was reached to recommend to the staff to conduct public meetings in or near the cities of Victorville, Palm Springs, El Centro and Oceanside. The two local jurisdiction meetings could be held in or near Victorville and in or near Oceanside. It was determined the meetings would be held in February or March.

QUESTIONS & POINTS OF INTEREST

Joe raised some questions and points of interest with the industry:

- NANPA has already assigned the relief NPA 442. If a 2-way split or an overlay is used the 442 would be assigned. If a split is ordered the CPUC would need to decide which side changes to the new NPA.
- If a split is adopted consideration should be given to the Freeway Call boxes in each county its believed these are wireless services and may involve more than one SP since there are several counties in the 760. Joe stated that no decision was needed at this time but should be noteworthy during the implementation of a split.

- Need recommendation on the disposition of the grandfathered code rated in a rate area outside of the 760 geography if it's a split, do they change or stay in 760? The code is the 612 NXX code assigned to the SNDG:SNDG rate area.
- Need decision by the CPUC if there is to be duplication of (853) time and 570 HVCI codes. The prior practice with Splits in California has been to duplicate the time and HVCI codes, however the CO Code administration guidelines do not allow this to automatically take place. Joe stated that the industry would be looking for direction from the CPUC on this issue.
- Need a Service Provider to volunteer to provide the test number during implementation. Joe stated that no decision is needed at this time but the industry members should consider being a volunteer to provide the test number.

Cherrie Conner – CPUC Staff mentioned that if it's a split or an overlay the alarm industry needs to be contacted to determine how long it would take them to convert their systems.

SPECIFIC INDUSTRY RECOMMENDATIONS

IDENTIFY THE DIALING PLAN

Joe stated that in California there exists a standard uniform dialing plan for all NPAs:

If an OVERLAY is adopted by the CPUC, the dialing plan is: 1+10-Digits (1+NPA+NXX+XXXX) for all local and toll (HNPA and FNPA) calls.

If a TWO-WAY SPLIT is adopted by the CPUC, the dialing plan is: 7-Digit (NXX-XXX) Local and Toll (HNPA). 1+10-Digits (1+NPA+NXX+XXXX) Local and Toll (FNPA).

ESTABLISH IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Joe asked the industry to suggest a recommendation to the CPUC on implementation Intervals – Network preparation and customer notice, length of permissive dialing and length of recorded announcement periods. A recommendation was made to recommend the following thirteenmonth implementation schedule to the CPUC:

OVERLAY IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Network preparation and distribution of Customer notices

Permissive Dialing/ Customer Education Period before Mand. 1+10D Dialing

Delay to open new NPA

1 Month

Total 13 Months

An agreement was reached to recommend the following fifteen-month implementation schedule to the CPUC for Alternative #4 (two-way split):

TWO-WAY SPLIT IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Network preparation and distribution of Customer notices

6 Months
Permissive Dialing Period
6 Months
Mandatory Dialing & Recorded Announcement Period
3 Months
Total 15 Months

REVIEW OF DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Joe stated he would have the draft minutes on NNS by October 24, 2006 and any changes could be provided to Joe instead of another conference call to approve the minutes by October 31, 2006, after then the minutes become final.

SCHEDULING OF LOCAL JURISDICTION AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

Joe inquired on the status of the LJ and public meeting from the CPUC – staff. Staff informed the industry that once the locations and dates have been determined for the LJ and public meetings they will issue a letter informing the industry. Staff stated the industry will need to inform their customers via a bill message. Staff stated they need contact information for the service providers. The CPUC will also post the public meetings on their website and issue a press release. Joe mentioned NANPA will also inform the industry of the CPUC's information letter on public meetings.

REVIEW OF RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

Joe stated that once the public meetings are concluded he will schedule another industry meeting for the review of the results of the public meetings and develop the industry's final recommendation to the CPUC for filing. A draft filing will be prepared for review.

FILING OF THE RELIEF PLAN WITH THE CPUC

In response to an inquiry, the CPUC Staff stated that similar to other relief proceedings under the Local Competition Docket, an ALJ ruling would be issued requesting comments from the industry regarding the relief plans. The timeframes discussed are as follows: the local jurisdiction and public meetings will be held in February - March 2007, the industry follow-up review meeting sometime in March and then NANPA would file the relief petition with the CPUC. Staff indicated a decision could be by October 2007 but no definite schedule or dates. Several industry members expressed concern that relief should be in place no later than June 2009.

There were no further discussion items and the meeting was adjourned.

#

760 NPA – CALIFORNIA Updated Relief Planning Meeting VIA CONFERENCE CALL October 10, 2006 - PARTICIPANTS

NAME	COMPANY
Alexandra Hanson	o1 Communication
Brenda Summerlin	Alltel
Renate Howell	AT&T
George Guerra	AT&T
Micki Burton	AT&T
Dan Meldazis	Broadwing
Jerome Candelaria	CCTA
Wes Jackert	Cingular
Darin Chester	Cingular
Kathy Heinz	Cingular
Elissa McOmber	Citizens / Frontier
Rob Powell	Citizens / Frontier
Sandra Gore	Cox Telecom
Cherrie Conner	CPUC
Michaela Pangilinan	CPUC
Helen Mickiewicz	CPUC
Marcus Nixon	CPUC
Mike Evans	CPUC
Sue Lamb	Fones 4 All
Joe Cocke	NANPA Relief Planning
Wayne Milby	NANPA Relief Planning
Cecilia Louie	NeuStar Pooling Imp.
Craig Winters	Sprint Nextel
Shiva Khazaei	Sprint Nextel
Pat Maroney	Sprint PCS
Karen Riepenkroger	Sprint
Joel Hurlbert	Sprint
Glori Trummer	TDS Telecom
Anne Chism	TDS Telecom
Gail Long	TDS Telecom
Maureen Matthews	Telscape Comm.
Paula Jordan	T-Mobile
Dianne Hart	Time Warner
Kathy Speicher	Time Warner
Tom Pease	Time Warner
Peter Casciato	Time Warner Cable Info Svcs
Jena Downs	Verizon
Yun Lee	Verizon
Dyan Adams	Verizon
Lorraine Kocen	Verizon
Joanne Edelman	Verizon Wireless
Kelly Faul	XO







